

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	David Fifield		
Assignee:	Broadcom Corporation		
Title:	Antenna Configuration for Wireless Communication Device		
Serial No.:	10/810,112	Filed:	March 26, 2004
Examiner:	Matthew C. Sams	Group Art Unit:	2617
Docket No.:	BP 3208	Customer No.:	34399

November 27, 2007

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF

Dear Sir:

Applicant submits this Supplemental Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Supplemental Answer mailed in this case on September 27, 2007. It is believed that no fees are due in connection with the filing of this Reply Brief, however, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct any amounts required for this Reply Brief and to credit any amounts overpaid to Deposit Account No. 502264.

Applicant maintains his position that Greer does not provide an enabling disclosure as required by 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for the reasons stated in Applicant's Reply Brief. In the Supplemental Answer, Examiner asserts that paragraph [33] of Greer suggests the "intent" to use "two or more antennas" and, therefore, allegedly provides support for claim 17. Applicants disagrees that this alleged "intent" provides support for claim 17. Regardless, the Greer reference fails to teach the first and second frequency limitation recited in Applicant's independent claims. The discussion in paragraph [33] cited by Examiner and the rest of the Greer reference emphasizes radiation pattern-diverse antennas.

Neither Greer nor He disclose first and second pairs of antennas operating at first and second frequencies. Independent claims 1 and 11 recite a first pair of antenna elements for transmitting and receiving RF signals at a first frequency and a second pair of antenna elements

for transmitting and receiving RF signals at a second frequency. Examiner's Supplemental Answer, like all previous correspondence from Examiner, fails to address the first and second frequency limitations recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

For the reasons set forth above and in prior briefs submitted by Applicant, the combination of Greer and He fails to disclose the limitation recited in independent claims 1 and 11 of "first and second pairs" of individual antenna elements for transmitting at first and second frequencies. It is apparent that the combination of He and Greer fails to anticipate independent claims 1 and 11 and, therefore, the rejection of claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be removed. Furthermore, the rejection of dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be removed since these claims are dependent from allowable base claims.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 - 20 be reversed.

FILED ELECTRONICALLY
November 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary W. Hamilton/

Gary W. Hamilton
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 31,834